Specific Heat of the Quantum Bragg Glass

Gregory Schehr,[1] Thierry Giamarchi,[2] and Pierre Le Doussal[1]

[1]*LPTENS CNRS UMR 8549 24, Rue Lhomond 75231 Paris Cedex 05, France*
[2]*DPMC, University of Geneva, 24 Quai Ernest-Ansermet, CH-1211 Geneva, Switzerland*

(Dated: February 1, 2008)

We study the thermodynamics of the vibrational modes of a lattice pinned by impurity disorder in the absence of topological defects (Bragg glass phase). Using a replica variational method we compute the specific heat C_v in the quantum regime and find $C_v \propto T^3$ at low temperatures in dimension three and two. The prefactor is controlled by the pinning length. The non trivial cancellation of the linear term in C_v arises from the so-called marginality condition and has important consequences for other mean field models.

PACS numbers:

arXiv:cond-mat/0212300v3 18 Jun 2003

Understanding the behavior of the specific heat in disordered and glassy systems is a longstanding theoretical challenge [1]. Its low temperature dependence has been observed to be linear in a variety of glasses, including amorphous solids, disordered crystals and spin glasses [2, 3, 4]. A phenomenological interpretation was proposed *assuming* the existence of two level systems [5] leading to such a linear behavior. Despite its remarkable success for many systems the range of applicability and microscopic justification of such arguments are still open questions. Analytical calculations based on models of quantum solids with structural disorder account for higher frequency features such as the "boson peak" [6, 7, 8] but produce only phonon-like specific heat $C_v \sim T^3$, except in the classical limit [9, 10]. On the other hand new possibility arises from recent developments of the mean field methods [11, 12] to quantum spin glasses [13, 14]. The glass phase is there described by a replica symmetry broken saddle point solution and evidence was found [13, 14] for a linear specific heat both in the p-spin and Heisenberg spin glasses. Since even in these solvable models the specific heat remains delicate to extract analytically, a later numerical study claims instead $C_v \sim T^2$ [15] and compares to experiments. It is thus still an outstanding problem to understand the behavior of the specific heat already at the level of the mean field description of quantum glasses.

In addition to structural and spin glasses, there has been considerable recent interest in pinned elastic systems where disorder originates from substrate impurities. Such systems cover a wide range of experimental situations both in the classical and quantum limit, such as vortex lattices in superconductors [16, 17, 18, 19], electron crystals [20, 21], charge and spin density waves [22], disordered liquid crystals [23], etc.. All these systems are characterized by a competition between disorder and elasticity, which leads to pinning and glassy behavior. Although the question of positional order and correlations is now better understood, with reasonable agreement between theory and experiments, the behavior of the specific heat is still largely not understood and, in some cases, affected by non equilibration effects [24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30].

It is thus crucial to develop a first principle method to compute the temperature dependence of the specific heat in such disordered elastic systems. Here we address this question for a Bragg glass system allowing both for thermal and quantum fluctuations [11] and obtain a quite general formula to compute the specific heat. We find that the term proportional to T in the specific heat vanishes. This leads to a T^3 behavior of C_v in all dimensions between 2 and 4. The Larkin Ovchinnikov pinning length is found to control the coefficient. The result holds for a periodic object, i.e. a Bragg glass, and for interfaces with continuous degrees of freedom. We elucidate the general mechanism leading, in the mean field approach, to the cancellation of the term linear in T. We discuss how this property allows to extract such a term in related quantum spin glass models. In a companion paper [9] we investigate the classical limit and the applications to vortex lattices.

Let us consider a collection of interacting quantum objects of mass μ whose position variables are denoted by a m-component vector $u_\alpha(R_i, \tau)$. The equilibrium positions R_i in the absence of any fluctuations form a perfect lattice of spacing a. Interactions result in an elastic tensor $\Phi_{\alpha,\beta}(q)$ which describes the energy associated to small displacements, the phonon degrees of freedom. Impurity disorder is modeled by a τ (imaginary time) independent gaussian random potential $U(x)$ interacting with the local density $\rho(x) = \sum_i \delta(x - R_i - u(R_i, \tau))$. We will describe systems in the weak disorder regime $a/R_a \ll 1$ where R_a is the translational correlation length, e.g. in a Bragg glass phase where the condition $|u_\alpha(R_i, \tau) - u_\alpha(R_i + a, \tau)| \ll a$ holds, no dislocations being present. At equilibrium the system is described by the partition function $Z = \mathrm{Tr} e^{-\beta H} = \int DuD\Pi e^{-S/\hbar}$ with Hamiltonian $H = H_{\rm ph} + H_{\rm dis}$:

$$H_{\rm ph} = \frac{1}{2}\int_q \frac{\Pi(q)^2}{\mu} + \sum_{\alpha,\beta} u_\alpha(q)\Phi_{\alpha,\beta}(q)u_\beta(-q)$$

$$H_{\rm dis} = \int d^dx U(x)\rho(x,u(x)) \quad (1)$$

and its associated Euclidean quantum action $-S[u,\Pi] = \int_\tau \int_q i\Pi_\alpha(q)\partial_\tau u_\alpha(q) - H$. Here $\int_q \equiv \int_{BZ} \frac{d^dq}{(2\pi)^d}$ denotes integration on the first Brillouin zone and all integrals over the imaginary time variable τ go from 0 to $\beta\hbar$, $\beta = 1/T$ being the inverse temperature.

For simplicity we illustrate the calculation on a isotropic system with $\Phi_{\alpha,\beta}(q) = cq^2\delta_{\alpha\beta}$ and denote disorder correlations $\overline{U(x)U(x')} = \Delta(x-x')$. The disorder average is performed using the replica trick $\overline{Z^k} = \int Du e^{-S_{\rm eff}/\hbar}$ and integrating over Π, after some manipulations [11] one obtains the following replicated action $S_{\rm eff} = S_{\rm ph} + S_{\rm dis}$ with:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\rm ph} &= \int d^dx d\tau \frac{c}{2}\sum_a (\nabla_x u_a)^2 + \frac{1}{v^2}(\partial_\tau u_a)^2 \\ S_{\rm dis} &= -\frac{1}{2\hbar}\int d^dx d\tau d\tau' \sum_{ab} R(u_a(x,\tau) - u_b(x,\tau')) \\ R(u) &= \rho_0^2 \sum_K \Delta_K \cos(K\cdot u) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here $v = \sqrt{c/\mu}$ is the pure phonon velocity and $\Delta_K = \int d^dx e^{iK\cdot x}\Delta(x)$ denote the harmonics of the disorder correlator at the reciprocal lattice vectors K, and $\rho_0 \sim a^{-2}$ the average areal density.

This quantum model is then studied using the Gaussian Variational Method (GVM) on the imaginary time action [11, 12, 31], implemented by choosing a trial action:

$$S_0 = \frac{1}{2\beta\hbar}\int_q \sum_{a,b=1}^{k}\sum_n G_{ab}^{-1} u_a(q,\omega_n)u_b(-q,-\omega_n) \quad (3)$$

where $k \to 0$ is the number of replicas. S_0 minimizes the variational free energy $F_{\rm var} = F_0 + \frac{1}{\beta\hbar}\langle S_{\rm eff} - S_0\rangle_{S_0}$, where F_0 denotes the free energy calculated with the trial action S_0. The specific heat is defined as follows

$$C_v(T) = -T\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial T^2} = \frac{\partial\overline{\langle H\rangle}}{\partial T} \quad (4)$$

where $\langle ...\rangle$ denotes a quantum and thermal average and $\overline{...}$ disorder averaged. Introducing replicas, one finds $\overline{\langle H\rangle}/\Omega = \frac{1}{k}\langle\sum_a H_{\rm ph}(u_a,\Pi_a) + \frac{2}{\beta\hbar}S_{\rm dis}\rangle_{S_{\rm eff}}$. Integrating over the Π_a fields we compute the resulting average using S_0 (which amounts exactly - thanks to the variational equations - to compute C_v using the variational free energy instead of the exact one). We obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\langle H\rangle}/(m\Omega) &= \frac{1}{\beta}\sum_n \int_q \frac{1}{2} + \frac{c}{2}(q^2 - \frac{1}{v^2}\omega_n^2)\tilde{G}(q,i\omega_n) \\ &+\frac{1}{\hbar}\int_0^{\beta\hbar} d\tau (V(\hbar\tilde{B}(\tau)) - \int_0^1 du V(\hbar B(u))) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where Ω is the volume of the system, $V(B) = -\rho_0^2\sum_K \Delta_K \exp(-BK^2/2)$ and $\omega_n = 2\pi n/\beta\hbar$ are the Matsubara frequencies. We have implicitly taken the limit $k \to 0$ in (5) : we denote $\tilde{G}(q,\omega_n) = G_{aa}(q,\omega_n)$ and parametrize $G_{a\neq b}(q,\omega_n)$ by $G(q,u)$, where $0 < u < 1$, which is ω_n independent. One has

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}(q,\omega_n) &= \frac{1}{c(q^2+\omega_n^2/v^2) + \Sigma + I(\omega_n)} \\ &+\delta_{n,0}\frac{1}{cq^2}(\frac{1}{u_c}\frac{\Sigma}{cq^2+\Sigma} + \int_0^{u_c}\frac{dv}{v^2}\frac{[\sigma](v)}{cq^2+[\sigma](v)}) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Similarly we take $\hbar B_{ab}(\tau) = \langle[u_a(x,\tau) - u_b(x,0)]^2\rangle/m$ with $\tilde{B}(\tau)$ and $B(u)$ which is τ independent. u_c and $[\sigma](v)$ are defined in Ref. [11, 31]. $\overline{\langle H\rangle}/(m\Omega)$ is then calculated using the solution of the variational equations [11, 31] where the best trial Gaussian action (3) is obtained by breaking the replica-symmetry (RSB). Although the RSB scheme, and the behavior of $B(u)$, depend in general on d and on $V(B)$, $C_v(T)$ depends on T only through u_c, Σ and $B = B(u > u_c)$:

$$1 = -4V''(B)\int_q \frac{1}{(cq^2+\Sigma)^2} \quad (7)$$

$$\Sigma = cR_c^{-2} \quad (8)$$

where R_c is the Larkin length, and (7) is the so called marginality condition (MC) which automatically holds here for $d \geq 2$. We recall here the variational equation [11], relevant for the computation of $C_v(T)$:

$$I(\omega_n) = \frac{2}{\hbar}\int_0^{\beta\hbar} d\tau(1-\cos(\omega_n\tau))(V'(\tilde{B}(\tau)) - V'(B)) \quad (9)$$

together with (7), where

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \frac{2}{\beta}\sum_n \int_q \frac{1}{cq^2 + c\omega_n^2/v^2 + \Sigma + I(\omega_n)} \\ \tilde{B}(\tau) &= \frac{2}{\beta}\sum_n \int_q \frac{1-\cos(\omega_n\tau)}{cq^2 + c\omega_n^2/v^2 + \Sigma + I(\omega_n)} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The solution of these coupled equations can be organized as an expansion in powers of $\hbar$, keeping $\beta\hbar$ fixed: $\Sigma = \Sigma_0 + \hbar\Sigma_1(\beta\hbar) + O(\hbar^2)$, $I(\omega_n) = I_0(\omega_n) + \hbar I_1(\omega_n,\beta\hbar) + O(\hbar^2)$ where one finds that the lowest order solution does not depend explicitly on $\beta\hbar$ (of course $I(\omega_n)$ always depends implicitly on $\beta\hbar$ through ω_n). In general, $\overline{\langle H\rangle}/\Omega$ and $C_v(T)$ will be functions both of $\hbar$ and $\beta\hbar$: $\overline{\langle H\rangle}/(m\Omega)(\hbar,\beta\hbar) = H_0 + \hbar H_1(\beta\hbar) + \hbar^2 H_2(\beta\hbar)...$, where H_0 is independent of $\beta\hbar$ from which it follows that

$$C_v(T) = C_v(\hbar,\beta\hbar) = C_0(\beta\hbar) + \hbar C_1(\beta\hbar) + ... \quad (11)$$

After some manipulations, we find for $d \geq 2$

$$\hbar H_1 = \frac{\hbar}{\beta\hbar}\sum_n \int_q \frac{cq^2 + \Sigma_0 + I_0(\omega_n)}{cq^2 + \frac{c}{v^2}\omega_n^2 + \Sigma_0 + I_0(\omega_n)} \quad (12)$$

where in that limit Σ_0 is fixed by (7) setting $B = 0$ and $I_0(\omega_n)$ satisfies the equation [11]

$$I_0(\omega_n) = -4V''(0)(J_1(\Sigma_0) - J_1(\Sigma_0 + \frac{c}{v^2}\omega_n^2 + I_0(\omega_n)))$$
$$J_n(z) = \int_q \frac{1}{(cq^2+z)^n} \tag{13}$$

from which we can extract the low ω behavior of its analytic continuation $I_0(\omega_n \to -i\omega + 0^+) = I_0'(\omega) + iI_0''(\omega)$:

$$I_0'(\omega) \simeq A\omega^2 \quad , \quad I_0''(\omega) \simeq -B\omega \tag{14}$$

with $A = \frac{c}{v^2}(1 - \frac{J_2 J_4}{2J_3^2})$ and $B = \sqrt{\frac{c}{v^2}\frac{J_2}{J_3}}$, where $J_n = J_n(\Sigma_0)$. Note that (12) correctly yields the equipartition for $\beta \to \infty$: $\hbar H_1 = T\int_q$. The expression (12) is more illuminating if we use a spectral representation of the Green function to transform the discrete sum over the Matsubara frequencies in an integral :

$$\hbar H_1 = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\omega}{\pi} \hbar\omega\rho(\omega) f_B(\omega) \tag{15}$$
$$\rho(\omega) = \frac{c}{v^2}\omega \int_q \mathrm{Im} G_c(q, \omega_n \to -i\omega + 0^+) \tag{16}$$
$$= \int_q \frac{c}{v^2}\omega \frac{-I_0''(\omega)}{(cq^2 - \frac{c}{v^2}\omega^2 + \Sigma_0 + I_0'(\omega))^2 + (I_0''(\omega))^2}$$

where $G_c^{-1}(q, \omega_n) = \sum_b G_{ab}^{-1}(q, \omega_n)$, $\rho(\omega)$ is the density of states and $f_B(\omega)$ the Bose factor. Eq. (15) is simply the internal energy of free excitations, whose density of states is given by $\rho(\omega)$, computed self-consistently within the variational method. As $\rho(\omega)$ does not depend, at this order, on temperature, all the temperature dependence is contained in the Bose factor. We thus obtain the specific heat

$$C_v = (\beta\hbar)^2 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\omega}{4\pi} \frac{\rho(\omega)\omega^2}{\sinh^2 \beta\hbar\omega/2} + O(\hbar) \tag{17}$$

Due to the Bose factor, the low T behavior is governed by the low ω behavior of the density of states. From (14) we see that $\rho(\omega) \sim -\omega I_0''(\omega) \sim \omega^2$, which leads to $C_v(T) \sim T^3$ in all dimensions $d \geq 2$. Surprisingly, the linear term in the specific heat cancels at lowest order in $\hbar$. This cancellation, and the resulting T^3 behavior occurs in fact to *all orders* in $\hbar$, as is shown below. This results in the following behavior at low temperature [36]

$$C_v(\hbar, \beta\hbar) = (C_0 + \hbar C_1 + \cdots)\left(\frac{T}{\hbar}\right)^3 + O((T/\hbar)^4) \tag{18}$$

C_1 will be given in [34] and we discuss here the dominant contribution (17). Although the T^3 behavior is independent of the dimension $2 \leq d \leq 4$, the coefficient itself does depend on it. More precisely

$$C_v \sim \frac{8\pi^3}{15}\sqrt{\left(\frac{c}{v^2}\right)^3 \frac{J_2(\Sigma_0)^3}{J_3(\Sigma_0)}}\left(\frac{T}{\hbar}\right)^3 + O(\hbar, (\beta\hbar)^{-4})$$
$$= \frac{4\pi^4}{15} K_d R_c^{3-d} F_{C_v}\left(\frac{R_c}{a}\right)\left(\frac{T}{\hbar v}\right)^3 + O(\hbar, (\beta\hbar)^{-4}) \tag{19}$$

where $K_d = S_d/(2\pi)^d$, S_d being the volume of the sphere in dimension d and $F_{C_v}(x)$ a scaling function. Choosing a spherical Brillouin zone, $F_{C_v}(x) = 2/\pi(f_2(x)^3/f_3(x))^{1/2}$, with $f_n(x) = \int_0^{2\pi x} du u^{d-1}/(u^2+1)^n$. If we compare this result to the Debye law for pure phonons,

$$C_{v\mathrm{Debye}} \sim \frac{4\pi^4}{15} K_d \left(\frac{T}{\hbar v}\right)^d \tag{20}$$

we see that $d = 3$ appears as a particular dimension below which the specific heat is lowered by the disorder although it is enhanced above. In three dimensions it remains of the Debye form with a prefactor governed by the scaling function $F_{C_v}(x)$:

$$F_{C_v}(x) \sim 1 \quad x \gg 1 \tag{21}$$
$$F_{C_v}(x) \sim \frac{16\pi^2}{3} x^3 \quad x \ll 1 \tag{22}$$

Note that since one does recover exactly the Debye law at vanishing disorder, the corrections at weak disorder are rather small. At stronger disorder $R_c \sim a$ the specific heat is significantly lowered by the disorder.

In the case $d < 2$, it was noticed in [11] that to obtain the correct behavior of dynamical quantities (e.g. the conductivity $\sigma(\omega) \sim \omega^2$) through linear response within the Matsubara equilibrium approach, one should enforce the MC (7), which arises naturally within the dynamical methods [14]. If we use this condition we obtain for $C_v(T)$ the expression (17) where in the numerator $\frac{c}{v^2}\omega^2$ is replaced by $-\frac{2-d}{2(4-d)}\Sigma_0 + \frac{c}{v^2}\omega^2$, and this leads to a negative specific heat at low T. However, if we use the thermodynamic condition, i.e. compute u_c by minimizing the variational free energy, the internal energy can again be written as (12) which guarantees the equipartition and a positive $C_v(T)$. Then $I(\omega_n) \sim \omega_n^2$, and $C_v(T)$ vanishes exponentially at low T, a signature of a gapped excitation spectrum. This apparent discrepancy between thermodynamic and dynamic quantities within the GVM, which occurs only for $d < 2$, is a hint of possible complications due to slow equilibration in these systems, as observed e.g. in Coulomb glass systems ([32, 33]).

Extracting the T-dependence to all orders in $\hbar$ is quite difficult, but we found a drastic simplification of the temperature dependence, at order T^2, of τ integrals such as in (5) and (9). Schematically, for *any* polynomial form $V(x) = x^p$, expressing B^p and $\tilde{B}(\tau)^p$ as multiple Matsubara sums using (10) and performing the τ integral, one explicitly checks that cancellations occur term by term in the multinomial expansion of $\tilde{B}(\tau)^p$. Details are given in [34]. This further allows to derive the cancellation of the contribution linear in temperature of C_v to all orders,

arising naturally as *a consequence of the marginality condition* (7), which, here for $d \geq 2$, holds automatically. We find that the self-energy takes the interesting form:

$$\Sigma + I(\omega_n) = \Sigma + M(1 - \delta_{n0}) + \tilde{I}(\omega_n) \quad (23)$$

$$\Sigma + M = \Sigma^{(0)} + O(T^4) \quad (24)$$

$$\tilde{I}(\omega_n) = \tilde{I}^{(0)}(\omega_n) + T^4 \tilde{I}^{(2)}(\omega_n) + \cdots \quad (25)$$

with $\Sigma = \Sigma^{(0)} + O(T^2)$ and $\tilde{I}(\omega_n) \sim |\omega_n| + O(\omega_n^2)$. The absence of T^2, T^3 dependences in Eq. (24,25) allows to show, using marginality, that no T^2 nor T^3 term survives in (5) for $d \geq 2$. For $d < 2$ the same conclusion as above persists (simply replacing Σ_0 by $\Sigma^{(0)}$).

The drastic simplification in T dependence found here is also useful to compute analytically the putative linear term in $C_v(T)$ in the quantum spin glasses. Both models in [13] and [14] are solved via a one step RSB solution, hence analogous to our $d < 2$ case, and thus are gapless provided the marginality condition is enforced (see discussion above). Ref. [14] studies the specific heat of the quantum p-spin model and obtain numerical evidence for a linear contribution. We find that this term vanishes. In Ref. [13] the SU(N) fully connected Heisenberg spin glass (of spin S) was solved for infinite N. There too it was found that the dominant term (analogous to C_0 here) in a $1/S$ semiclassical expansion also behaves as $\sim T^3$. Whether it holds to higher order in $1/S$ has been discussed in [35] and [15] and is currently under investigation [34]. In all cases a structure similar to (23,24,25) also holds.

One can discuss the validity of the mean field method. The GVM can also be used to describe non periodic systems (e.g. directed polymer) in terms of a power law $V(B)$ [12, 31] and then becomes exact for $m \to \infty$ with $R(u) = -mV(u^2/m)$. We thus expect that the T^3 behavior is exact in this limit in the full RSB case. For the periodic problem it is always an approximation which describes the vibrational phonon-like excitations of the pinned system and may not treat accurately excitations such as solitons. Whether these solitons or other type of excitations such as dislocations for a lattice could reestablish a linear contribution to the specific heat from two level systems type behavior remains to be investigated.

This weak T-dependence of the specific heat in the quantum regime is relevant to the so-called vortons modes of the vortex lattice of superconductors. Other contributions such as core electrons [24], or their interaction with vortons (responsible for the dissipation in the quantum dynamics of the vortons) yield linear specific heat [26] which may dominate over the present one in the quantum regime. Whether this also holds in the classical regime for the vortons is examined in [9].

In conclusion we have obtained from first principles the specific heat of an elastic quantum pinned system, such as the Bragg glass phase of a lattice in presence of impurities. We found that $C_v \sim T^3$ in $d = 2, 3$ due to a non trivial mechanism of cancellation of the linear term. This simplification which occurs from the marginality condition will be useful for a general understanding of the specific heat behavior within the mean field theory. The question remains concerning the contribution of other types of excitations such as plastic deformations. Further analytical and numerical investigations would be desirable to a better understanding of the behavior of the specific heat in glasses.

We acknowledge G. Blatter, L. F. Cugliandolo, S. Florens, A. Georges, L. Ioffe, T. Klein, P. Monceau, O. Parcollet and C. Varma for helpful discussions.

[1] R. C. Zeller and R. O. Pohl, Phys. Rev. B **4**, 2029 (1971).
[2] K. Binder, A. P. Young, Rev. Mod. Phys. **58** 801 (1986).
[3] W. A. Phillips, J. Non-Crys. Solids **31**, 267 (1978).
[4] D. A. Ackerman et al., Phys. Rev. B **23**, 3886 (1981).
[5] P. W. Anderson, B. I. Halperin, and C. M. Varma, Phil. Mag. B **25**, 1 (1972).
[6] A.J. Dianoux et. al in *Dynamics of Disordered Materials II.*, (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1993) and Ref. therein.
[7] W. Schirmacher et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 136 (1998).
[8] T. S. Grigera et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 85502 (2001).
[9] G. Schehr et al., (2003), cond-mat/0301053.
[10] W. Schirmacher et al., Phys. Stat. Sol. B **230**, 31 (2002).
[11] T. Giamarchi and P. Le Doussal, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 15206 (1996).
[12] M. Mézard and G. Parisi, J. de Phys. I **1**, 809 (1991).
[13] A. Georges, O. Parcollet, and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 134406 (2001).
[14] L. F. Cugliandolo et al., Phys. Rev. B **64**, 14403 (2001).
[15] A. Camjayi and M. J. Rozenberg, cond-mat/0210407 , (2002).
[16] G. Blatter et al., Rev. Mod. Phys. **66**, 1125 (1994).
[17] T. Giamarchi and P. Le Doussal, *Statics and dynamics of disordered elastic systems* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1998), p. 321, cond-mat/9705096.
[18] T. Nattermann and S. Scheidl, Adv. Phys. **49**, 607 (2000).
[19] T. Giamarchi and S. Bhattacharya, in *High Magnetic Fields: Applications in Condensed Matter Physics and Spectroscopy*, edited by C. Berthier et al. (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002), cond-mat/0111052.
[20] T. Giamarchi, in *Strongly correlated fermions and bosons in low dimensional disordered systems*, edited by I. V. Lerner et al. (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 2002), cond-mat/0205099.
[21] R. Chitra et al., Phys. Rev. B **65**, 035312 (2001).
[22] G. Grüner, *Density Waves in Solids* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1994).
[23] K. Saunders et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 4309 (2000).
[24] C. Caroli et al., Phys. Lett. **9**, 307 (1964).
[25] G. E. Volovik, JETP Lett. **58**, 469 (1993).
[26] G. Blatter and B. I. Ivlev, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 10272 (1994).
[27] L. N. Bulaevskii and M. P. Maley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3541 (1993).
[28] K. Izawa et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 1327 (2001).
[29] J. Odin et al., Eur. Phys. J. B **24**, 315 (2001).
[30] J. C. Lasjaunias, K. Biljakovic, and P. Monceau, Phys.

Rev. B **53**, 7699 (1996).
[31] T. Giamarchi and P. Le Doussal, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 1242 (1995).
[32] Z. Ovadyahu J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys. **19**, 5187 (1986).
[33] O. Cohen et al. Phys. Rev. B **50**, 10442 (1994).
[34] G. Schehr et al., (2002), in preparation.
[35] O. Parcollet (2002), private communication.
[36] The cumbersome expression for $\overline{\langle H \rangle}/\Omega$ will be given elsewhere [34] but we just mention that it does not reduce anymore to the "free particles" contribution (15).